

1 MICHAEL M. EDWARDS, ESQ.
2 Nevada Bar No. 6281
3 NICHOLAS L. HAMILTON
4 Nevada Bar No. 10893
5 Wolfenzon Rolle Edwards
6 6725 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 260
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
8 (702)836-3138
9 medwards@wolfenzon.com
10 nhamilton@wolfenzon.com

11 Attorneys for Defendants Camping World, Inc.
12 Wheeler RV Las Vegas, LLC, and Winnebago Industries, Inc.

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 KIM BOLIBA,

16 Plaintiff,
17 vs.

18 CAMPING WORLD, INC.; CAMPING WORLD
19 RV SALES, LLC.; WHEELER LAS VEGAS RV
20 d/b/a CAMPING WORLD RV SALES,
21 WINNEBAGO INDUSTRIES, INC., DOES 1-10;
22 and ROE Corporations 1-10,

23 Defendants.

24 CASE NO.: 2:14-cv-01840-JAD-NJK

25 **DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
26 SUPPORT OF MOTION
27 FOR SUMMARY
28 JUDGMENT PURSUANT
TO FED. R. CIV. P. 56**

29
30 Defendants Camping World, Inc. ("Camping World"), Wheeler RV Las Vegas, LLC
31 ("Wheeler") and Winnebago Industries, Inc. ("Winnebago"), ("Defendants") by and through
32 their counsel of record, Wolfenzon Rolle Edwards, respectfully submits their Reply in support
33 of their motion for summary judgment made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 as to all of Kim
34 Boliba's ("Plaintiff") causes of action asserted against Defendants in the Plaintiff's Second
35 Amended Complaint ("Second Amended Complaint").

36 //

37 //

38

39

40

41

This motion is based on the memorandum in support, any papers and pleadings on file, any oral argument adduced by counsel, and any other matters appropriate for this Court's determination.

DATED this 20 day of January, 2016.

WOLFENZON ROLLE EDWARDS

MICHAEL M. EDWARDS, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 6281
NICHOLAS L. HAMILTON
Nevada Bar No. 10893
6725 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 26
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
702-836-3138

Attorneys for Defendants Attorneys for
Defendants Camping World, Inc.
Wheeler RV Las Vegas, LLC, and Winnebago
Industries, Inc.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. OVERVIEW

The Plaintiff's opposition presents the following questions, asserting that they each present a triable issue of fact. This is not the case.

1 First, is the vehicle sold Plaintiff Kim Boliba a 2013 or a 2014 model?

The RV is a 2014 model. As discussed in Defendants' motion and as reiterated below, statutory authority and testimony of employees of the California DMV the evidence conclusively establishes that the RV is 2014 model. The Plaintiffs have no evidence to dispute this fact apart from their bald assertions and speculations derived from Winnebago's brochures.

2 Did the Plaintiffs' receive the brochures?

This question is irrelevant. There is not an iota of evidence that indicates that Winnebago's' brochures were material to the discussions engaged in at the time of purchase, nor is there any evidence that the Plaintiffs harbored any expectations based upon information contained within those brochures. The Plaintiffs did not see the brochures until months after

1 the time of purchase. The Plaintiffs repeatedly inspected the RV and test drove it as well prior
 2 to purchase. The Plaintiffs got the RV they wanted and the brochures simply do not figure
 3 into the basis of the bargain.

4 3. *Did Mr. Duston conceal the brochure in order to sell a 2013 model to Mr.
 5 Boliba?*

6 There is no evidence of any concealment with regard to any issue pertinent to this
 7 matter. The Plaintiffs received a new 2014 Winnebago Itasca Ellipse 42GD. The RV was
 8 assembled in stages. The VIN for the *Freightliner chassis* is 2013, but the final stage of
 9 assembly is determinative and it is the final stage of assembly that mandates that this RV be
 10 designated a 2014. The Plaintiffs purchased a 2014 Winnebago Itasca Ellipse 42GD and that
 11 is precisely what they received.

12 4. *Is there a genuine issue of fact as to whether the non-conformities or defects
 13 are what either expert claims?*

14 No. Dr. Guentzler's report simply presents a laundry list of issues, most of which are
 15 of no consequence and her admitted at this deposit that almost all of the issues were cosmetic.
 16 Further the Plaintiff has not provided any evidence that the alleged defects fall under any valid
 17 warranty, did not while in the possession of the consumer or were not a result of unreasonable
 18 use (including failure to provide reasonable and necessary maintenance).

19 5. *Did Mr. Boliba give Defendants a chance to make repairs on the subject
 20 vehicle?*

21 No. The only limited warranty at issue in this litigation is the one year limited issue
 22 by Winnebago. The Good Sam Extended warranty purchased by the Plaintiff¹ named
 23 Camping World RV Sales as the administrator of the warranty and that entity was dismissed
 24 from the case.

25 After the initial repairs were conducted prior to the Plaintiff's purchase, the Plaintiff
 26 took possession of the RV and never presented it for warranty repair within the twelve month

27 28

 1 The extended warranty was attached to the Plaintiff's opposition but does not appear to have been disclosed
 during discovery. The Defendants' Motion provided a detailed explanation of the Plaintiffs' dilatory discovery
 practices. These practices appear to continue on to the present.

1 period that Winnebago's limited warranty was in effect. This is indisputable. The only
 2 assertion the Plaintiff makes in contradiction concerns conversations he claims to have had
 3 with Camping World Las Vegas and Camping world Vacaville. When the Plaintiff went to
 4 Vacaville, he did not even take the RV with him.²

5 Notwithstanding, the Plaintiffs make no effort to identify which issues might actually
 6 be covered by Winnebago's limited warranty when the Plaintiff took the RV to Findlay RV.

7 **II. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT OF FACTS**

8 **A. The evidence establishes that the subject RV is a 2014 model.**

9 The Plaintiff persists in his contention that the RV is a 2013 rather than a 2014 model
 10 year. Prior to the filing of the Defendant's motion, the Plaintiff based his contentions upon
 11 its erroneous registration with the California Department of Motor Vehicles. As the
 12 Defendants have pointed out the Plaintiff's partner, Richard Wheatley, admitted during his
 13 deposition that when he and the Plaintiff took the RV to the California DMV to have it
 14 registered, the DMV employee actually gave them the option of having the RV registered as
 15 either a 2013 or 2014 model year, and asked Plaintiff and Mr. Wheatley “[d]o you want me
 16 to register it as a '13 or '14?”³ Kitty Kramer, an administrator of the California DMV
 17 confirmed during her deposition that the RV was registered incorrectly, and should have been
 18 registered as a 2014 model year pursuant to California DMV vehicle registration policies and
 19 procedures.⁴

20 In the face of these facts, the Plaintiff now bases his claims upon specious conclusions
 21 and outright speculation concerning Winnebago's sales brochures. In short, the Plaintiff
 22 argues that since the brochures show RVs with two awnings and list colors other than
 23 “Platinum,” as paint options, the RV must be a 2013 model.

24

25 ² See Ex. Y, additional excerpts of transcript of deposition of Richard Wheatley, p. 77:12-19.

26 ³ See Ex. C, Deposition Transcript of Richard Wheatley, at 56:1-2.

27 ⁴ See Ex. D, Deposition Transcript of Kitty Kramer, CA DMV PMK, at 40:17-22; 45:18-46:1; *see also* Ex. E,
 28 Email Communication from California DMV and relevant section from the Vehicle Industry Registration
 Manual explaining that the model year of “split-year” motorhomes (i.e., when the chassis and body are completed
 in different years) is designated by the final stage motorhome manufacturer; here, the motorhome was designated
 a 2014 model year by the final stage motorhome manufacturer, Winnebago .

1 The only evidence offered by the Plaintiff's concerning whether such features as paint
 2 schemes or awnings are exclusive to particular model years comes from an examination of
 3 Winnebago's brochures.

4 The Plaintiffs' opposition makes the bizarre allegation that Winnebago "concealed"
 5 the brochures because the brochures contributed to the basis of the bargain. There is no
 6 evidence that the brochures contributed to the discussion in any way. The inescapable fact is
 7 that the Plaintiff physically examined the *subject* RV, and Mr. Wheatley test drove *that* RV
 8 and the Plaintiff agreed to purchase *that* RV along with the features present on *that* RV:

9 19 Q. And you got the RV that you inspected, correct?
 10 20 A. Correct.
 11 21 Q. You got the RV that you chose yourself, correct?
 12 22 A. Correct.
 13 23 Q. You got the RV that you and Mr. Wheatley test drove,
 14 24 correct, or that he test drove, correct?
 15 25 A. Yeah, for about five miles.
 16 ...
 17 1 Q. You got the RV that you paid for, correct, the one
 18 2 that you selected?
 19 3 A. Correct.⁵

20 Kim Boliba further testified:

21 10 Q. Sorry. How many times did you say Richard test
 22 11 drove it?
 23 12 A. Once or twice
 24 20 Q. How long did you and Mr. Wheatley inspect the RV
 25 21 prior to purchase?
 26 22 A. We went twice, with the salesman both times.
 27 23 Q. On different days?
 28 24 A. Yes.
 29 25 Q. And for how many hours did you inspect it?
 30 1. A. Two.
 31 2. Q. Each day? Or one hour each day approximately?
 32 3. A. I can't remember exactly.⁶

33 The Plaintiff simply cannot argue that the brochures raised any expectations that were
 34 not met by the RV they saw themselves purchased in person. The Plaintiff's arguments based
 35 upon the brochures are *non sequitur* to any relevant issue and must be discarded.

36 Further, brochures are not by any means an authoritative source concerning model
 37 years. As Defendants' expert, Enoch Hutchcraft points out:

38
 39 ⁵ See Ex. Z, additional excerpts of transcript of deposition of Plaintiff, Kim Boliba at p.65; 67

40 ⁶ See Ex. Z at Kim Boliba p.48, 49.

1 These brochures are rife with proper disclaimers from Winnebago
 2 Industries explaining that the items in the photographs and spec sheet are
 3 subject to change. In addition to the formal disclaimers, it is common
 4 practice for RV manufacturers to carry exterior paint colors, paint
 5 schemes along with interior fabrics as well as floor plans forward from
 6 one year to the next. It is also common for early model year units to have
 7 similar or even identical exterior paint colors, paint schemes, interior
 8 fabrics, floor plans and other specs as prior model years because
 9 motorhomes are typically manufactured continuously throughout the
 10 calendar year.⁷

11 In the end, any doubts that the brochures may raise as to the RV's model year are
 12 obviated by the conclusive deposition testimony and statutory authority that establishes that
 13 the RV is a 2014 model as discussed above.

14 **B. The Defects complained of by the Plaintiff, if they even exist, do not**
 15 **substantially impair the value of the RV and any subjective dissatisfaction**
 16 **the Plaintiff claims he feels is exaggerated for the purpose of this litigation.**

17 The Plaintiff's expert William Guentzler, Ph.D. conceded that nearly all of Plaintiff's
 18 alleged "defects" are actually minor cosmetic imperfections for which Plaintiff has produced
 19 no evidence he did not cause himself through normal wear and tear during the nearly twenty-
 20 one (21) months he owned the RV (including approximately 2,000 thousand miles of driving
 21 and many weeks of living in the RV⁸). Specifically, Plaintiff's expert Dr. Guentzler took 123
 22 photographs of the RV and testified that the vast majority of the alleged defects in the
 23 photographs were "cosmetic" rather than functional.⁹

24 All of Plaintiff's alleged "defects"¹⁰ appear to be a direct result of Plaintiff's failure to
 25 provide reasonable and necessary maintenance to the RV or are extremely minor and cosmetic
 26 in nature and therefore not covered under warranty.

27 Regardless of whether the defects were cosmetic or functional, the Plaintiff did not
 28 provide any evidence that the alleged defects were not caused by the Plaintiff. Instead, the
 29 alleged defects were likely caused by the Plaintiff through his use. Plaintiff and Mr. Wheatley
 30 both testified that he and Plaintiff have driven the subject RV for approximately 2,000 miles.¹¹

26
 27 ⁷ Hutchcraft Page 17 of 22

⁸ See Ex. F, 42:13-16.

⁹ See Ex. I, Deposition of William Guentzler, 206:6-215:12.)

¹⁰ See Ex. Q, "AmendedComp0038-39," Plaintiff's Handwritten List of Thirty (30) Alleged Defects,

¹¹ See Ex. C, 20:4-13, see also Ex. F, 42:13-16.

1 Plaintiff testified that since purchasing the RV, he and Mr. Wheatley have driven the RV on
 2 trips to California; Tulsa, Arizona; and Nevada.¹²

3 Despite Plaintiff's allegations to the contrary, Winnebago has repeatedly reached out
 4 to Plaintiff and has offered to correct any warranty-covered defects but Plaintiff has refused
 5 to oblige.

6 Plaintiff has presented the RV to Defendants for inspection, but not for any warranty
 7 repair work.

8 **C. The Plaintiff contends that the Defendants have refuse to repair the RV,**
 9 **in point of fact, the Plaintiff himself has declined to present the RV for**
repair since he purchased it.

10 Repairs were performed prior to the Plaintiffs picking up the RV to address 30 issues
 11 raised by the Plaintiffs.¹³ The Plaintiff's RV was inspected by Mr. Guenztler on March 5,
 12 2015, 15 months after the Plaintiffs took delivery of the RV. The Plaintiffs never identify
 13 which specific issues were not addressed prior to their purchase. What is undisputed is that
 14 the Plaintiffs took delivery of the RV at the time of purchase and never returned with it to
 15 have warranty work performed.¹⁴

16 The Plaintiffs' opposition relies solely upon vague assertions from the depositions of
 17 Kim Boliba and Richard Wheatley to assert that necessary repairs were indefinitely delayed
 18 while awaiting receipt of repair parts. The Plaintiff's opposition make no effort to identify
 19 which parts were on order and why that their purported exchanges with Camping World Las
 20 Vegas and Vacaville prevented them from presenting their RV, even once, for repairs since
 21 they picked it up in December of 2013. With regard to which parts had been on order, the
 22 entire universe of documentation that the Plaintiff relies upon are those attached as Plaintiff's
 23 Exhibit 8, Bates stamped WINN0021-WINN0041.

24 To this day, the Plaintiff has not brought his RV back for warranty repairs after they
 25 picked it up. Given the severity of the Plaintiff's allegations concerning the state of the RV,

26 ¹² See Ex. F, 41:14-42:4.

27 ¹³ See Ex. Y, 23:9-18.

28 ¹⁴ The Plaintiffs had work performed on the RV by Apache RV that was never disclosed. See Ex. Y, 33:13-17;
 41:2-6. Aside from the deposition testimony of Mr. Wheatley, we have no of knowing precisely what work was
 performed at this time.

1 this behavior is simply not rational, and cannot be explained away by the Plaintiffs' purported
 2 exchanges with Camping work Vacaville and Camping World Las Vegas.

3 With regard to the Plaintiff's alleged exchanges hearsay exchanges with Findlay RV,
 4 the Plaintiffs make no effort to identify which issues might actually be covered by
 5 Winnebago's limited warranty, the terms of which are not subject to dispute. In any event,
 6 the exchange with Findlay occurred **after the one year manufacturer's warranty with**
7 Winnebago had lapsed.¹⁵

8 Defendants were agreeable to having Findlay RV repair any warranty-covered defects,
 9 but Plaintiff only wanted Findlay RV to perform an inspection of the RV (in effect having
 10 Defendants' affiliated dealer act as Plaintiff's expert on Defendants' dime). In fact, to this
 11 date, Plaintiff has never—ever—taken the RV to any dealership to have any warranty-covered
 12 defects actually repaired.

13 **D. Stripped of any other substantial factual basis for maintaining a claim, the**
Plaintiff now relies upon the unfounded an speculative allegation the RV
was involved in an accident that caused he windshield to be damaged.

14 The testimony of Dr. Guentzler proffered by the Plaintiffs concerning "major" non-
 15 cosmetic defects is limited to Dr. Guentzler's testimony regarding an "impact" that is
 16 speculated to have occurred to the windshield and which affected its fit and finish.¹⁶ There is
 17 zero evidence of the RV having been involved in an accident of any kind prior to its transfer
 18 to the Plaintiffs. Further, Dr. Guentzler has no way of knowing what may have happened to
 19 the RV in the 15 months it was in the Plaintiffs' hands before he inspected it. As discussed
 20 above, the Plaintiffs failed to disclose work performed by Apache RV prior to the deposition
 21 of Richard Wheatley. Additionally, the Plaintiff and Mr. Wheatley inspected the RV for two
 22 hours and test drove it upon purchase. If the window issues were truly as egregious as Dr.
 23 Guentzler states they are, and if they existed upon the time of purchase. Then it stands to
 24 reason that either the Plaintiff or Mr. Wheatley should have noticed it.

25 As discussed in the Defendants' motion, the transfer of title documentation indicates
 26 that Plaintiff purchased the RV directly from the dealer who purchased the RV directly from

27
 28 ¹⁵ See Plaintiff's Exhibit 8, WINN0013.

¹⁶ See Plaintiffs' SOF, Paragraph 26.

1 Winnebago; the transfer of title documentation further indicates that the odometer reading—
 2 which Plaintiff filled in himself—was 1,839 miles at the time of purchase, which
 3 approximately equates to the driving distance from the Winnebago manufacturing facility to
 4 Camping World Las Vegas.

5 **E. The report of Enoch Hutchcraft places the Plaintiff's defect allegations**
 6 **and Dr. Guentzler's report in their proper context and shows that the**
 7 **Plaintiff's subjective dissatisfaction with RV is not objectively credible.**

8 The Plaintiff seeks to minimize the testimony of Enoch Hutchcraft, by characterizing
 9 him as a mere mechanic. This is a grossly inaccurate representation. As Mr. Hutchcraft's
 10 experience includes, among other things, a 23 year tenure as vice president of the Monaco
 11 Coach Corporation. A copy of Mr. Hutchcraft's curriculum vitae is attached hereto.¹⁷

12 Mr. Hutchcraft's report appropriately and objectively conveys the import of the
 13 Plaintiffs' issues, the vast majority of which are not issues at all. The Plaintiff's opposition
 14 cites to Milicevic,¹⁸ but glosses over the objective component of the two part test in that case
 15 while relying exclusively upon the Plaintiff's subjective appraisal of those issues. Mr.
 16 Hutchcraft's report appropriately addresses the objective component of the Milicevic test.

17 Further, the Plaintiff never presented his RV for warranty work after he purchased it.
 18 This is proof positive that the Plaintiff's issues, from their own subjective point of were
 19 inconsequential as these issues apparently did not bother the Plaintiff overmuch. This matter
 20 presents a classic example of minor issues blown out of all proportion solely for the purpose
 21 of litigation.

22 The Plaintiff's own testimony demonstrates that he is unconcerned with having repairs
 23 performed:

24 //
 25 //
 26

27 ¹⁷ Ex. AA, curriculum vitae of Enoch Hutchcraft.

28 ¹⁸ Milicevic v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1168, 1176 (D. Nev. 2003) aff'd sub nom. Milicevic v. Fletcher Jones Imports, Ltd., 402 F.3d 912 (9th Cir. 2005) citing Gen. Motors Corp. v. Dohmann, 247 Conn. 274, 291, 722 A.2d 1205, 1214 (1998)(emphasis added).

1
2
3 15 Q. Do you plan on keeping the RV if the alleged
4 16 warranty-covered defects are repaired and corrected?
5 17 A. No, I don't, because it's not the correct year.
6 18 Q. So your goal is to get rid of the RV?
7 19 A. The goal is for them to honestly give me a 2'14 as
8 20 promised, as sold to me, not a 2'13 trying to disguise as a
9 21 2'14 and trying to litigate it as a 2'14. I think that's very
10 22 dishonest of them.¹⁹

11 As the above testimony demonstrates, the Plaintiff does not care if his RV repaired.
12 He instead insists upon pursuing his baseless allegation that the RV is anything but a 2014
13 model. It is far more likely that Mr. Boliba now seeks to employ the judicial process to
14 alleviate his buyer's remorse.

15 III. SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS PROPER

16 A. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against Plaintiff's Claims of 17 Violation of the Nevada Lemon Law under NRS § 597.600 et seq. Because 18 the RV is a 2014 Model Year and All Alleged Defects are the Result of 19 Plaintiff's Failure to Provide Reasonable and Necessary Maintenance

20 The Plaintiff's discussion regarding the Nevada Lemon Law is limited to their
21 assertions that the Defendants allegedly failed "to make or allow the required repairs."²⁰

22 1. *Neither presumption set forth in NRS § 597.630 applies.*

23 Neither presumption set forth in NRS § 597.630, the portion cited by the Plaintiff, has
24 any applicability to the facts of this case. The Plaintiff cites²¹ This case is distinguishable in
25 that it involved allegations of defects to an automobile, a Mercedes-Benz S-500.²² Further,
26 the court's application of facts to the law in Milicevic was very straightforward and does not
27 open the statute to interpretation as the Plaintiffs' opposition suggests. As to subsection (a),
28 the automobile in Milicevic involved issues that persisted through four or more episodes of
repair, including serious issues with the brakes. No similar set of circumstances exists here.

29 As to subsection (b), there is no evidence whatsoever that the RV was out of service
30 for any length of time since it was purchased. The District Court Judge in Milisevic found a

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
5550
5551
5552
5553
5554
5555
5556
5557
5558
5559
55510
55511
55512
55513
55514
55515
55516
55517
55518
55519
55520
55521
55522
55523
55524
55525
55526
55527
55528
55529
55530
55531
55532
55533
55534
55535
55536
55537
55538
55539
55540
55541
55542
55543
55544
55545
55546
55547
55548
55549
55550
55551
55552
55553
55554
55555
55556
55557
55558
55559
555510
555511
555512
555513
555514
555515
555516
555517
555518
555519
555520
555521
555522
555523
555524
555525
555526
555527
555528
555529
555530
555531
555532
555533
555534
555535
555536
555537
555538
555539
555540
555541
555542
555543
555544
555545
555546
555547
555548
555549
555550
555551
555552
555553
555554
555555
555556
555557
555558
555559
5555510
5555511
5555512
5555513
5555514
5555515
5555516
5555517
5555518
5555519
5555520
5555521
5555522
5555523
5555524
5555525
5555526
5555527
5555528
5555529
5555530
5555531
5555532
5555533
5555534
5555535
5555536
5555537
5555538
5555539
5555540
5555541
5555542
5555543
5555544
5555545
5555546
5555547
5555548
5555549
5555550
5555551
5555552
5555553
5555554
5555555
5555556
5555557
5555558
5555559
55555510
55555511
55555512
55555513
55555514
55555515
55555516
55555517
55555518
55555519
55555520
55555521
55555522
55555523
55555524
55555525
55555526
55555527
55555528
55555529
55555530
55555531
55555532
55555533
55555534
55555535
55555536
55555537
55555538
55555539
55555540
55555541
55555542
55555543
55555544
55555545
55555546
55555547
55555548
55555549
55555550
55555551
55555552
55555553
55555554
55555555
55555556
55555557
55555558
55555559
555555510
555555511
555555512
555555513
555555514
555555515
555555516
555555517
555555518
555555519
555555520
555555521
555555522
555555523
555555524
555555525
555555526
555555527
555555528
555555529
555555530
555555531
555555532
555555533
555555534
555555535
555555536
555555537
555555538
555555539
555555540
555555541
555555542
555555543
555555544
555555545
555555546
555555547
555555548
555555549
555555550
555555551
555555552
555555553
555555554
555555555
555555556
555555557
555555558
555555559
5555555510
5555555511
5555555512
5555555513
5555555514
5555555515
5555555516
5555555517
5555555518
5555555519
5555555520
5555555521
5555555522
5555555523
5555555524
5555555525
5555555526
5555555527
5555555528
5555555529
5555555530
5555555531
5555555532
5555555533
5555555534
5555555535
5555555536
5555555537
5555555538
5555555539
5555555540
5555555541
5555555542
5555555543
5555555544
5555555545
5555555546
5555555547
5555555548
5555555549
5555555550
5555555551
5555555552
5555555553
5555555554
5555555555
5555555556
5555555557
5555555558
5555555559
55555555510
55555555511
55555555512
55555555513
55555555514
55555555515
55555555516
55555555517
55555555518
55555555519
55555555520
55555555521
55555555522
55555555523
55555555524
55555555525
55555555526
55555555527
55555555528
55555555529
55555555530
55555555531
55555555532
55555555533
55555555534
55555555535
55555555536
55555555537
55555555538
55555555539
55555555540
55555555541
55555555542
55555555543
55555555544
55555555545
55555555546
55555555547
55555555548
55555555549
55555555550
55555555551
55555555552
55555555553
55555555554
55555555555
55555555556
55555555557
55555555558
55555555559
555555555510
555555555511
555555555512
555555555513
555555555514
555555555515
555555555516
555555555517
555555555518
555555555519
555555555520
555555555521
555555555522
555555555523
555555555524
555555555525
555555555526
555555555527
555555555528
555555555529
555555555530
555555555531
555555555532
555555555533
555555555534
555555555535
555555555536
555555555537
555555555538
555555555539
555555555540
555555555541
555555555542
555555555543
555555555544
555555555545
555555555546
555555555547
555555555548
555555555549
555555555550
555555555551
555555555552
555555555553
555555555554
555555555555
555555555556
555555555557
555555555558
555555555559
5555555555510
5555555555511
5555555555512
5555555555513
5555555555514
5555555555515
5555555555516
5555555555517
5555555555518
5555555555519
5555555555520
5555555555521
5555555555522
5555555555523
5555555555524
5555555555525
5555555555526
5555555555527
5555555555528
5555555555529
5555555555530
5555555555531
5555555555532
5555555555533
5555555555534
5555555555535
5555555555536
5555555555537
5555555555538
5555555555539
5555555555540
5555555555541
5555555555542
5555555555543
5555555555544
5555555555545
5555555555546
5555555555547
5555555555548
5555555555549
5555555555550
5555555555551
5555555555552
5555555555553
5555555555554
5555555555555
5555555555556
5555555555557
5555555555558
5555555555559
55555555555510
55555555555511
55555555555512
55555555555513
55555555555514
55555555555515
55555555555516
55555555555517
55555555555518
55555555555519
55555555555520
55555555555521
55555555555522
55555555555523
55555555555524
55555555555525
55555555555526
55555555555527
55555555555528
55555555555529
55555555555530
55555555555531
55555555555532
55555555555533
55555555555534
55555555555535
55555555555536
55555555555537
55555555555538
55555555555539
55555555555540
55555555555541
55555555555542
55555555555543
55555555555544
55555555555545
55555555555546
55555555555547
55555555555548
55555555555549
55555555555550
55555555555551
55555555555552
55555555555553
55555555555554
55555555555555
55555555555556
55555555555557
55555555555558
55555555555559
555555555555510
555555555555511
555555555555512
555555555555513
555555555555514
555555555555515
555555555555516
555555555555517
555555555555518
555555555555519
555555555555520
555555555555521
555555555555522
555555555555523
555555555555524
555555555555525
555555555555526
555555555555527
555555555555528
555555555555529
555555555555530
555555555555531
555555555555532
555555555555533
555555555555534
555555555555535
555555555555536
555555555555537
555555555555538
555555555555539
555555555555540
555555555555541
555555555555542
555555555555543
555555555555544
555555555555545
555555555555546
555555555555547
555555555555548
555555555555549
555555555555550
555555555555551
555555555555552
555555555555553
555555555555554
555555555555555
555555555555556
555555555555557
555555555555558
555555555555559
5555555555555510
5555555555555511
5555555555555512
5555555555555513
5555555555555514
5555555555555515
5555555555555516
5555555555555517
5555555555555518
5555555555555519
5555555555555520
5555555555555521
5555555555555522
5555555555555523
5555555555555524
5555555555555525
5555555555555526
5555555555555527
5555555555555528
5555555555555529
5555555555555530
5555555555555531
5555555555555532
5555555555555533
5555555555555534
5555555555555535
5555555555555536
5555555555555537
5555555555555538
5555555555555539
5555555555555540
5555555555555541
5555555555555542
5555555555555543
5555555555555544
5555555555555545
5555555555555546
5555555555555547
5555555555555548
5555555555555549
5555555555555550
5555555555555551
5555555555555552
5555555555555553
5555555555555554
5555555555555555
5555555555555556
5555555555555557
555555

1 violation of the Lemon Law after it was determined that it was defendant's repair shop 55
 2 days. In this instance, the RV never left the Plaintiff's possession and there is no evidence
 3 that the RV was ever unfit for its use as an RV.

4 2. *The Defendants have not been afforded an adequate opportunity to*
perform repairs.

5 As to the question of whether the issues complained of persisted through a reasonable
 6 number of repair attempts, Defendants assert they have not had an adequate opportunity
 7 to perform repairs. Again the Plaintiff relies upon Milicevic to argue that the RV was
 8 substantially impaired. One significant manner in which the present case differs from
 9 Milicevic is that the automobile in that case was presented for repairs 8 days after purchase
 10 and those repairs caused vehicle to be in the defendant's repair shop for 33 days.²³ The vehicle
 11 was returned for additional repairs two months later where it remained in the repair shop for
 12 another 17 days. In this instance, the Plaintiff had repairs performed prior to purchase, but
 13 has not presented it for additional repairs since and approximately 15 months passed before it
 14 was inspected by Dr. Guentzler.

15 The Plaintiff has not presented his RV for repairs since he purchased it. Rather he
 16 weakly and generally argues that he was given a "runaround" when describing his hearsay
 17 discussions with various unnamed employees of various dealerships. Despite Plaintiff's
 18 allegations to the contrary, Winnebago has repeatedly reached out to Plaintiff and has offered
 19 to correct any warranty-covered defects but Plaintiff has refused to oblige. Plaintiff has
 20 presented the RV to Defendants for inspection, but not for any warranty repair work, the
 21 Plaintiff's self-serving testimony notwithstanding.

22 3. *The Plaintiff must show substantial impairment objectively as well*
as subjectively and there is no evidence that what issues may be
present are not due to the Plaintiff's own use of the RV.

24 The test of substantial impairment has both a subjective and objective component:

25 "The standard is subjective in that the fact finder **first** must examine the
 26 subjective desires, needs and circumstances of the particular customer.
 27 In light of those desires, needs and circumstances, **the fact finder then**
must make an objective determination as to whether the value of the

28 ²³ Milicevic, 256 F. Supp. 2d at 1171 (D. Nev. 2003).

motor vehicle to the consumer has, in fact, been substantially impaired.

In making this determination, the fact finder must determine that the consumer's subjective desires, needs and circumstances are reasonable.”²⁴

The Plaintiff simply glosses over the objective component of the Milicevic test, arguing instead that if the Plaintiff is perturbed to any degree by an issue, then he must recover. This is not the case.

Again, the subjective impairment of the RV to the Plaintiff, or the lack thereof, appears to be illustrated by his failure to present to RV for repair after purchase. Further, Plaintiff and Mr. Wheatley both testified that he and Plaintiff have driven the subject RV for approximately 2,000 miles.²⁵ Plaintiff testified that since purchasing the RV, he and Mr. Wheatley have driven the RV on trips to California; Tulsa, Arizona; and Nevada.²⁶ The RV was clearly functional and the individual issues complained of by the Plaintiff do not appear to have been an overriding concern.

Dr. Guentzler even admitted the vast majority of the alleged defects in the photographs that he took of the RV were “cosmetic” rather than functional. Defendants’ expert Enoch Hutchcraft noted that nearly all of Dr. Guentzler’s reported “defects” are actually cosmetic imperfections rather than actual warrantable defects that affect functionality. Further, Mr. Hutchcraft inspected the subject RV and opined that the RV did not contain any defects.

Regardless, the Plaintiff did not provide any evidence that the alleged defects were not caused by the Plaintiff. Instead, the alleged defects were likely caused by the Plaintiff through his use. All of Plaintiff's alleged RV "defects"²⁷ appear to be a direct result of Plaintiff's failure to provide reasonable and necessary maintenance to the RV or are extremely minor and cosmetic in nature and therefore not covered under warranty. Many of these defects were easily cured during an inspection with Defendants' expert and Defendant representatives (e.g., by simply changing the input setting to turn the allegedly "completely non-functional" and "defective" TV on).

²⁴ Milicevic v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1168, 1176 (D. Nev. 2003) aff'd sub nom. Milicevic v. Fletcher Jones Imports, Ltd., 402 F.3d 912 (9th Cir. 2005) citing Gen. Motors Corp. v. Dohmann, 247 Conn. 274, 291, 722 A.2d 1205, 1214 (1998)(emphasis added).

²⁴ 274, 291, 722 A.2d 1203, 1214 (1998) (emphasis added).
²⁵ See Ex. C 20:4-13. See also Ex. E 42:13-16.

²⁶ See Ex. F, 42:13-16.

²⁷ See Ex. F, 41:14-42:4.

²⁷ See Ex. Q, "Amended Comp 0038-39, Plaintiff's Handwritten List of Trinity (30) Alleged Defects,"

1 Further, Plaintiff's allegation that Defendants have allegedly refused or delayed to
 2 repair the alleged defects is a direct result of Plaintiff repeatedly refusing Winnebago's
 3 repeated overtures to repair any warranty-covered defects. This behavior objectively
 4 contradicts the Plaintiff's assertions that the RV is substantially impaired.

5 **B. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against Plaintiff's Claim for**
 6 **Breach of Contract Because the RV is a 2014 Model Year as Designated**
by the Final Stage Manufacturer

7 In opposition to the Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to breach of
 8 contract, the Plaintiff raises four arguments, most of which are duplicative of the Plaintiff's
 9 other assertions.

10 First, the Plaintiff asserts that the vehicle sold to Mr. Boliba was riddled with defects
 11 in breach of the contract between the parties. The report of both Mr. Hutchcraft and even Mr.
 12 Guetzler illustrate that the RV is not "riddled with defects" as discussed above.

13 Second, Mr. Boliba believes that he never had an opportunity to view the 2013 and
 14 2014 brochures for the Winnebago Itasca Ellipse and this led him to choose the a different RV
 15 than he otherwise might have. The Plaintiff also argues that a reasonable jury could find that
 16 Defendants Camping World and/or Wheeler Las Vegas RV actually sold him a 2013 model
 17 instead of a 2014 model.

18 This is bald speculation and irrelevant in any event. The Plaintiff obtained the RV that
 19 he wanted at the time of purchase. The subject RV was inspected multiple times and test
 20 driven by Mr. Wheatley, his partner. There is no evidence aside from the Plaintiff's own self-
 21 serving testimony that the brochures were in any way relevant to discussions engaged in at
 22 the time of purchase. The Plaintiff desired a 2014 model Winnebago, and he received a 2014
 23 Winnebago.

24 To reiterate, motor homes are multistage vehicles, and unlike cars, are generally built
 25 in two separate stages by two different manufacturers. The final stage motor home
 26 manufacturer (i.e., the manufacturer of the body of the motor home) has authority to designate
 27

1 the model year of the completed motor home.²⁸ The Plaintiff himself testified at his deposition
 2 that he is aware that motor homes can built in separate stages in different years.²⁹

3 Here, the manufacturer of the chassis of the completed RV, Freightliner Custom
 4 Chassis, did not identify the chassis by specific year on the Certificate of Origin because the
 5 RV was an incomplete vehicle under 49 CFR § 565.13(a)³⁰. The manufacturer of the body of
 6 the motor home, Winnebago, under its authority as the final stage motor home manufacturer,
 7 identified the RV as a 2014 model year.³¹ Therefore, the RV is a 2014 model year.

8 Additionally, §2.150 of the California DMV Internal Registration Manual clearly
 9 states that the final stage motor home manufacturer assigns the model year to the motor home,
 10 even in instances when the chassis has a VIN indicating a different year than the serial number
 11 of the body of the motor home. Furthermore, the American Association of Motor Vehicle
 12 Administrators (“AAMVA”—of which the Director of the California Dept. of Motor
 13 Vehicles is an officer—has published its official policy position that “the model year of a new
 14 complete vehicle shall be the only year recorded in the motor vehicle agency files and on the
 15 registration and title.”³²

16 Moreover, Kitty Kramer, the California DMV person most knowledgeable regarding
 17 registration of motor homes,³³ testified that based upon her review of the documents for the
 18 subject RV (including the RV’s certificate of origin), the RV should have been registered as
 19 a 2014 model year because that is the model year assigned by the final-stage motor home
 manufacturer.

20 Please recall that Richard Wheatley admitted during his deposition that when he and
 21 the Plaintiff took the RV to the California DMV to have it registered, the DMV employee
 22 actually gave them the option of having the RV registered as either a 2013 or 2014 model
 23

24
 25
 26 ²⁸ See Ex. S, Federal Trade Commission Informal Staff Opinion, dated March 5, 2001.

27 ²⁹ See Ex. F, 25:9-26:10.

28 ³⁰ See Ex. Q, “AmendedComp0025,” Chassis Certificate of Origin.

³¹ See Ex. Q, “AmendedComp0023,” Winnebago Certificate of Origin.

³² See Ex. U, Policy Positions of the AAMVA, “Multi-Stage Vehicle Titling” at ¶ 6.

³³ See Ex. D, 8:14-9:2.

1 year.³⁴ Thus, it was Plaintiff's own choice to have it registered as a 2013 model year at the
 2 DMV office.

3 Lastly, the Plaintiff argues that a jury could find that these Defendants knew or should
 4 have known, based on Dr. Guentzler's testimony that the subject vehicle was defective in
 5 breach of the agreement. Again, Dr. Guentzler admitted the vast majority of the alleged
 6 defects in the photographs that he took of the RV were "cosmetic" rather than functional.³⁵
 7 Whereas the Plaintiff had owned and used the RV for 15 months prior to Dr. Guentzler's
 8 inspection, Dr. Guentzler is hardly in any position to opine as to the condition of the RV when
 9 it left the factory.

10 **C. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against the Plaintiff's Claim of**
Deceptive Trade Practices

11 The Plaintiff asserts that the Defendants knowingly made false representations as to
 12 the model year of the subject vehicle and/or the condition of the vehicle at the time of
 13 purchase. For the reasons discussed above, there was no false representation regarding the
 14 model year of the RV. The RV was presented to be a 2014 model, and it is in fact a 2014
 15 model. This fact is established by Enoch Hutchcraft, applicable statutes and the impartial
 16 testimony of the California Department of Motor Vehicle's Person Most Knowledgeable.
 17 Further, the Plaintiff cannot establish that the RV is substantially impaired for the reasons
 18 discussed above.

19 The Plaintiff next asserts that the Defendants knew or should have known that the
 20 subject vehicle was in a collision causing the damage and knew or should have known of the
 21 faulty repairs to the windshield. There is no evidence that the RV was in a collision prior to
 22 its purchase by the Plaintiff. It is entirely possible that something may have happened after
 23 the Plaintiff took possession; he did after all have undisclosed repairs performed at another
 24 RV service provider, Apache RV. Dr. Guentzler's assertion that Defendants must be
 25 responsible for the state of the windshield at the time he inspected the RV is entirely without
 26 foundation.

27

28 ³⁴ See Ex. C, 55:11-56:11.

³⁵ See Ex. I, 206:6-215:12.)

1 Lastly, the Plaintiff argues that the Defendants violated the Magnuson-Moss Warranty
 2 Act and that this violation, by extension, constitutes a deceptive trade practice.

3 The Defendants did not violate the Magnuson Moss-Warranty Act, for the reasons
 4 discussed below.

5 **D. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against Plaintiff's Claims**
Arising Under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act Because All Alleged
Defects are the Result of Plaintiff's Failure to Submit the RV for
Warranty Repairs

6 The Plaintiff makes the conclusory argument that Winnebago, and only Winnebago,
 7 violated its express warranty when Camping World failed to perform repairs. The Plaintiff
 8 again fails to provide any evidence that the alleged defects fall under Winnebago's limited
 9 warranty.

10 In any event, as discussed above, Plaintiff has refused to submit the RV for warranty
 11 repairs, and the RV is no longer under warranty. Therefore, it is impossible for Defendants to
 12 remedy the alleged defects considering that Plaintiff refuses to submit the RV for any
 13 warranty-covered repairs and no longer have an obligation to do so even if any previously
 14 covered defects do exist. Under such circumstances, the Plaintiff can hardly claim that repairs
 15 were denied.

16 However, repairs were performed prior to the Plaintiffs picking up the RV to address 30
 17 issues raised by the Plaintiffs.³⁶ The Plaintiff's opposition makes no effort to identify which parts
 18 were on order, how those part orders correlate with either the Plaintiff's or Dr. Guentzler's list of
 19 issues and why their purported exchanges with Camping World Las Vegas and Vacaville
 20 prevented them from presenting their RV, even once, for repairs since they picked it up in
 21 December of 2013.

22 What is undisputed is that the Plaintiffs took delivery of the RV at the time of purchase
 23 and never returned with it to have warranty work performed.³⁷

24
 25
 26 ³⁶ See Ex. Y, 23:9-18. The Plaintiffs never identify which specific issues were not addressed prior to their
 purchase.

27 ³⁷ The Plaintiffs had work performed on the RV by Apache RV that was never disclosed. See Ex. Y, 33:13-17;
 41:2-6. Aside from the deposition testimony of Mr. Wheatley, we have no way of knowing precisely what work
 was performed at this time.

E. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against Plaintiff's Claim Arising Under NRS § 104.1203 Because All Alleged Defects are the Result of Plaintiff's Failure to Provide Reasonable and Necessary Maintenance

The Plaintiff's argues that Defendant Wheeler Las Vegas RV breached its covenant of good faith and fair dealing by failing to disclose the defective nature of the RV, failing to disclose that the RV was in a prior accident (an assertion by Dr. Guentzler that is otherwise unsupported by the record). The Plaintiff further argues that Wheeler is liable for breaching implied covenants when is sales-representative, Mr. Duston failed to download brochures from Winnebago's website because "that would have endangered the sale."

The lack of any evidence indicating that the RV was involved in an accident prior to its purchase has by the Plaintiff been discussed repeatedly throughout this reply. The odometer reading—which Plaintiff filled in himself—was 1,839 miles at the time of purchase, which approximately equates to the driving distance from the Winnebago manufacturing facility to Camping World Las Vegas. Dr. Guentzler has no way of knowing what may have happened to the RV in the 15 months it was in the Plaintiffs' hands before he inspected it. As discussed above, the Plaintiffs failed to disclose work performed by Apache RV prior to the deposition of Richard Wheatley. It's entirely possible that the window issue spoken of by Dr. Guentzler, if it exists, arose during the Plaintiff's tenure of ownership. The Plaintiff certainly cannot present evidence indicating that any such condition is due to its state of manufacture.

As to the model, Defendants have offered up conclusive deposition testimony and statutory authority that establishes that the RV is a 2014 model as discussed above.

F. Summary Judgment Should Be Granted Against Plaintiff's Claim For Fraud Because Plaintiff Failed To Provide Evidence of Fraud And The RV Is A 2014 Model Year, And Was New At The Time Of Purchase

The Plaintiff's opposition bases his claim for fraud in part upon the premise that the RV is a 2013 model year and not a 2014 model year. Of course, for reasons already discussed, the RV is in fact a 2014 model year. This simple fact rendered irrelevant the Plaintiff's secondary assertion: that the sale Representative, Robert Duston, failed to provide a sales brochure at the time of purchase.

The Plaintiff also persists in his assertion that the RV was involved in an accident, prior to the Plaintiff's purchase of which there is no evidence.

1 The Plaintiff's opposition fails to provide evidence of fraud by any of the Defendants
2 and this claim should be dismissed.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a), and for the reasons stated herein, Defendants
5 respectfully request this Honorable Court grant summary judgment in favor of all Defendants
6 and against all of Plaintiff's claims, and dismiss this action with prejudice. The Defendants
7 pray for all other just relief.

8 DATED this 20 day of January, 2016.

9 **WOLFENZON ROLLE EDWARDS**

10 
11 MICHAEL M. EDWARDS, ESQ.
12 Nevada Bar No. 6281
13 NICHOLAS L. HAMILTON
14 Nevada Bar No. 10893
15 6725 Via Austin Parkway, Suite 260
16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
17 702-836-3138

18 *Attorneys for Defendants* Attorneys for
19 Defendants Camping World, Inc.
20 Wheeler RV Las Vegas, LLC, and Winnebago
21 Industries, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Wolfenzon Rolle Edwards and that on this 20 day of January, 2016, I did cause a true copy of **DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 56** to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing. Based on the records currently on file, the Clerk of the Court will transmit a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

8 Randal R. Leonard, Esq.
9 Law Office of Randal R. Leonard, Esq.
10 500 S. Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

11 rleonard999@yahoo.com

12 | *Attorney for Plaintiff*



An employee of WOLFENZON ROLLE EDWARDS

EXHIBIT Y

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

KIM BOLIBA,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No.:
CAMPING WORLD, INC.; CAMPING WORLD) 2:14-cv-01840-JAD-NJK
RV SALES, LLC; WHEELER LAS VEGAS)
RV d/b/a CAMPING WORLD RV SALES,)
WINNEBAGO INDUSTRIES, INC.,)
DOES 1-10; and, ROE Corporations)
1-10,)
Defendants.)
)

DEPOSITION OF RICHARD WHEATLEY

Taken at the Law Offices of
Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker
300 South Fourth Street
11th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

On Tuesday, June 2, 2015
At 1:03 p.m.

Reported by: Sarah M. Winn-Boddie, CCR No. 868

Richard Wheatley

June 2, 2015

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiff:

RANDAL R. LEONARD, ESQ.
Randal R. Leonard, Ltd.
500 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 598-3667
rleonard999@yahoo.com

5 For Defendants Camping World, Inc., Wheeler RV Las Vegas,
6 LLC, and Winnebago Industries, Inc.:

7 WILSON ELSER
8 TYSON HAFEN, ESQ.
9 300 South Fourth Street
11th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

10 (702) 727-1400

11
12 *****

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

1	I N D E X	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	RICHARD WHEATLEY	
4	Examination by Mr. Hafen	5
5	Examination by Mr. Leonard	79
5	Further Examination by Mr. Hafen	87
6		
7		
8		
9	EXHIBITS	MARKED
10	A	Photograph
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT
(714) 486-0737

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

1 A. Let's see. On the interior, there was a few light
2 covers that were missing. There was light bulbs that were
3 burned out. There was a trim piece that was -- come loose by
4 the dishwasher, I think a towel bar that was not secured
5 properly.

6 Outside, I remember pointing out that there was a
7 couple scratches on the window frame and a few other things,
8 but then again, it's all in the list that we've given you.

9 Q. Did Camping World resolve those issues you just
10 pointed out prior --

11 A. Some of them.

12 Q. Which ones did they not correct?

13 A. I honestly don't recall which ones were which and
14 which ones we found after the fact. I know that they fixed
15 the -- one of the trims around the windows and they put the
16 toilet paper holder in and, you know, the light covers. But
17 other than that, I can't recall which ones were before and
18 after.

19 Q. Did you sign any of the documents with any of the
20 defendants?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Did you deal at all with the financing?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Did you meet with Mr. Gottlieb?

25 A. I was present.

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

1 blinds that are not working, the shades that are not -- that
2 one actually has fallen off numerous times and we've -- I've
3 put it back up there and finally have just given up and we
4 just don't use it anymore. It stays down.

5 Q. Did you open or close any of the blinds during the
6 walk-through or two other inspections prior to purchase?

7 A. Not that I recall.

8 Q. Next, "The blinds on entry door broke off
9 completely."

10 A. Those, we had to actually have replaced because the
11 whole thing broke completely.

12 Q. Who replaced them?

13 A. I don't -- it's an RV repair that's near where we
14 have the RV stored. I don't recall the name. I can -- I
15 think it's Apache RV that did the work. It was something
16 around \$700.

17 Q. Who paid?

18 A. We did.

19 Q. Have you been reimbursed at all --

20 A. No.

21 Q. -- for that payment?

22 Do you know whether or not that was covered under
23 warranty?

24 A. I have no idea. I would hope so.

25 Q. "The television in the bedroom infrared doesn't work

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

1 What does that mean?

2 A. There was a plumbing leak in the sewage hookup
3 compartment where the water and all the hookups are which has
4 since been fixed.

5 Q. Who fixed it?

6 A. I think it was Apache RV.

7 Q. When did they fix it?

8 A. Don't recall.

9 Q. Do you know why Mr. Boliba failed to disclose that
10 Apache RV did any repairs on the RV?

11 A. He probably forgot. Again, I was the one more
12 mechanical with it so I probably made the arrangements and it
13 might have just been fixed and he may not have even be aware
14 of it.

15 Q. When you passed along -- when you and Mr. Boliba
16 passed along this information to your attorney, has it mainly
17 been you communicating with Mr. Leonard or Mr. Boliba?

18 A. Both of us.

19 Q. Okay. "It appears that significant body work was
20 done underneath the vehicle."

21 A. Mm-hmm.

22 Q. Why do you say that? What evidence do you have
23 that --

24 A. Just overpainting, overspray, the use of insulating
25 foam, new pieces that it appears to have been, you know,

Richard Wheatley
June 2, 2015

1 or since we sought the advice of an attorney, not to go there.

2 Q. Has anyone at Camping World or Winnebago told you
3 that your RV is no longer under warranty?

4 A. Not that I know of.

5 Q. So after you purchased the RV, the only times you
6 presented the RV to any dealership for repair work were at
7 Findlay, and did you ever take it back to Camping World?

8 A. Well, they had it initially to do the repairs that
9 we had on the walk-through, to start the repairs and order the
10 parts that they needed, which we tried to get sent to the one
11 in Vacaville, and then we tried it at Findlay --

12 Q. But Vacaville, you didn't take the RV with you,
13 right?

14 A. No, because it took forever. They couldn't --
15 Camping World here couldn't seem to get parts shipped
16 correctly to Vacaville or in one piece. That took months just
17 to get it, you know, coordinated with Vacaville. And in that
18 time, we came back down from -- went to Yuma and back to here
19 so we never made it in to Vacaville.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. Or the parts never got there before we left and
22 ended up back here.

23 Q. Did you return to Las Vegas on several occasions to
24 have -- strike that.

25 Has Camping World ever refused to perform repairs?

EXHIBIT Z

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KIM BOLIBA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CAMPING WORLD, INC.; CAMPING WORLD
RV SALES, LLC; WHEELER LAS VEGAS
RV d/b/a CAMPING WORLD RV SALES,
WINNEBAGO INDUSTRIES, INC.,
DOES 1-10; and, ROE Corporations
1-10,

Defendants.

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

Case No.:
2:14-cv-01840-JAD-NJK

DEPOSITION OF KIM BOLIBA

Taken at the Law Offices of
Wilson, Elser, Moskowitz, Edelman & Dicker
300 South Fourth Street
11th Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

On Tuesday, June 2, 2015
At 10:01 a.m.

Reported by: Sarah M. Winn-Boddie, CCR No. 868

**U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT
(714) 486-0737**

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiff: RANDAL R. LEONARD, ESQ.
3 Randal R. Leonard, Ltd.
4 500 South Eighth Street
5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
6 (702) 598-3667
7 rleonard999@yahoo.com

8 For Defendants Camping World, Inc., Wheeler RV Las Vegas,
9 LLC, and Winnebago Industries, Inc.:

10 WILSON ELSER
11 TYSON HAFEN, ESQ.
12 300 South Fourth Street
13 11th Floor
14 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

15 (702) 727-1400

16 Also Present: Richard Wheatley

17 *****

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT
(714) 486-0737

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1	I N D E X	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	KIM BOLIBA	
4	Examination by Mr. Hafen	5
	Examination by Mr. Leonard	96
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	EXHIBITS	MARKEDE
10	A Register of Actions	16
11	B Document Entitled "Answers From RVIA: Split Model Years"	25
12	C Certificates of Origin for a Vehicle	28
13	D National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT Printout	33
14	E Document Entitled "New Vehicles Sold by California Dealers, Vehicle Industry Registration Procedures"	36
15	F Photocopy of Business Card	40
16	G Buyer's Order	67
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1 A. Once or twice.

2 Q. You said they gave it to you for two or three days
3 to get familiar with it?

4 A. No. No. No. After you buy it, it is advised that
5 you stick around two or three days because you have to learn
6 about it so you can go back to the dealership and ask
7 questions because you can't possibly absorb everything there
8 is to learn right there when they give you the final sales
9 talk after you purchase it.

10 Q. Sorry. How many times did you say Richard test
11 drove it?

12 A. Once or twice.

13 Q. For how long each time?

14 A. I don't remember. It's not like we went very far,
15 just a few miles down the road. They don't let you like take
16 it out of state or anything.

17 Q. Is it fair to say that Mr. Wheatley wanted the RV
18 more than you did?

19 A. No.

20 Q. How long did you and Mr. Wheatley inspect the RV
21 prior to purchase?

22 A. We went twice, with the salesman both times.

23 Q. On different days?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And for how many hours did you inspect it?

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1 the finance guy. And also, I don't know her name but the
2 finance guy at Camping World called his manager, which was a
3 lady for the whole western US territory for Camping World.
4 She talked to me personally and she said it has nothing to do
5 with you or your credit, sometimes they get overloaded with
6 loans, they have a number of loans per month that they want
7 to -- they don't want to be -- that they approve, that they
8 don't want to be overloaded with loans, so sometimes, you
9 know, they reach their -- their saturation point and you've
10 got to wait, but I will talk to them and your loan is an
11 excellent loan. There's no reason why this loan shouldn't be
12 approved. There's not a flaw in it. We'll get this loan
13 approved. She intervened and somehow the loan got approved.

14 Q. Ultimately, you purchased the RV on approximately
15 December 10th, 2013, correct?

16 A. The sales contract says 12/10/2'13.

17 Q. So yes?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And you got the RV that you inspected, correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. You got the RV that you chose yourself, correct?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. You got the RV that you and Mr. Wheatley test drove,
24 correct, or that he test drove, correct?

25 A. Yeah, for about five miles.

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1 me.

2 MR. HAFEN: What exhibit are we on?

3 THE COURT REPORTER: G.

4 MR. HAFEN: Okay. Exhibit G.

5 (Exhibit G marked for identification.)

6 BY MR. HAFEN:

7 Q. What does this document look like?

8 A. Sales -- sales --

9 Q. Like your sales agreement, sales contract?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. On page 5 of your complaint, which you don't have in
12 front of you, paragraph 32 reads, "At the time of purchase of
13 the subject RV, Plaintiff was provided with written warranty
14 materials that are hereby incorporated by reference as though
15 fully set forth herein."

16 Where is that written warranty? Do you still have a
17 copy of it?

18 A. I probably do in my file at home.

19 Q. Okay. But you haven't produced it yet in this case,
20 have you?

21 A. I don't remember at this time.

22 Q. If it exists.

23 MR. LEONARD: I believe we did, a Good Sam warranty.

24 MR. HAFEN: Okay.

25 THE WITNESS: That's -- yeah. That was an extended

Kim Boliba
June 2, 2015

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. We've gone over this twice already.

3 Q. Okay. So you're contending that it's no longer
4 under warranty?

5 A. I contend the warranty work should still be done
6 because we got the list of warranty items to them for warranty
7 work to be done before the warranty date was up, and that's
8 what they told us at the Winnebago dealer that mattered.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. Whether it's true or not, I don't know, but that's
11 what they informed us.

12 Q. What's your end goal in filing this lawsuit?

13 A. Just to get what I think is rightfully mine that I
14 paid for, what is fair and honest.

15 Q. Do you plan on keeping the RV if the alleged
16 warranty-covered defects are repaired and corrected?

17 A. No, I don't, because it's not the correct year.

18 Q. So your goal is to get rid of the RV?

19 A. The goal is for them to honestly give me a 2'14 as
20 promised, as sold to me, not a 2'13 trying to disguise as a
21 2'14 and trying to litigate it as a 2'14. I think that's very
22 dishonest of them.

23 Q. What amount are you claiming in damages?

24 A. That's still to be determined. I mean, they tried
25 to dismiss it. They applied to the Court three time -- three

EXHIBIT AA

Enoch Hutchcraft
4257 Barger Drive #204
Eugene, Oregon 97402
541 915 8441

Work history/ CV
Technical expertise

RVForensics@cvcable.net

July 31, 2015

RVForensics LLC March 2012 - Present

Member-Consulting and Expert Witness services for RV related matters

"Lemon Law" and warranty issue expert consultation, investigation, inspection, reports and testimony for litigation, pre-litigation, NHTSA recall, service contract matters related to all forms of Recreational Vehicles. Gas puller chassis, Diesel pusher chassis, entry level to luxury level Motorhomes, Bus conversions, Travel trailers, 5th Wheel trailers, Retail and wholesale value expert. Expert regarding all service and warranty issues, manufacturing and sales issues. Interior, exterior, paint, fiberglass, lamination, powertrain, chassis, axles, alignment, drivability complaints, cabinetry, mold, water intrusion. Expert consulting regarding fire and collision loss issues beyond cause & origin and crash investigation. Legal expert support for all areas of RV use, service, sales, construction or loss.

Monaco RV LLC June 2009 – March 2012

Director of Powertrain Development

Responsible for integration of all Navistar Inc. MaxxForce Diesel brand engines into Monaco RV, LLC. products. From MxF 7 to MxF 15 all horse power ratings all products. MxF 10 EPA 2007 all models MxF EPA 2010. "Hands on" and senior management level responsibility for delivering completed RV powertrain product. Individually Designed commercial cooling system for engine packages, i.e. radiator, charge-air-cooler hydraulics, ancillary drives etc. Commercial systems were adapted to military application and subjected to Mil Spec testing. System is now in military use.

FMVSS & CMVSS, (code compliance) responsibility for entire vehicle chassis and "house".

Legislative interface for RV industry. RVIA, IALLA, as well as Monaco-specific legislative efforts. Testimony at legislative hearings, state and federal level. Former Member of Public and Legislative Affairs Committee, former Chairman Lemon-Law sub-committee RVIA. Member International Association of Lemon Law Administrators.

Monaco Coach Corporation August 1986 - June 2009

Vice President

Executive level person responsible for managing legal defense. In addition to my "Hands on" expert analysis and testimony experience, I supervised the team that had operational responsibility for supplying expert witness testimony, product documentation and technical expertise to lawyers and/or direct interface with extra-judicial state entities. Direct responsibility to take cases from filing to resolution, whether mediated

settlement or trial verdict (500+ cases). Provided expert technical and organizational testimony for all phases of RV design, chassis design and construction, sales, service, warranty. Provided fire cause & origin support and expertise. Provided vehicle crash investigation support and expertise.

Executive and hands on operational and design responsibility for RoadMaster Chassis Division of Monaco Inc. Engine/powertrain integration for Cummins, Caterpillar and Detroit Diesel engines, GM and Ford gasoline engines. GM, Ford, EATON and Allison transmissions, Rockwell, Westport and EATON etc drive and steer axles. Steering and suspension systems including direct design of outboard mounted air-bag chassis suspension system.

Responsible for departmental and corporate budgets ranging from a few hundred, to many millions dollars. Initial assignment was to create factory service center, warranty, parts departments and processes. Address dealer and consumer requirements when interfacing with factory. Executive level supervision with hands-on participation for engineering, code compliance and QC department functions (ANSI, SAE, FMVSS, ANSI 119.2, NFPA 501C, NHTSA / TREAD act code and compliance). Responsible for training director, manager and supervisor level personnel for these departments as the company grew in size. Initially personally trained RV service technicians and compliance personnel at factory and dealership, developed factory service school, contributed to RVIA service school creation/curriculum.

RV Show sales support and day to day wholesale sales. Sold Monaco RV products directly to consumers and dealers. Direct support of dealer interface with Monaco for all issues. Participated in more than 200 shows.

Road test driver at shows. Designed course, gave direct instruction to many hundreds of RV drivers.

Authored magazine articles for Monaco Coach Club publications. Initially one club magazine then four separate magazines. This writing assignment lasted for more than 20 years. Authored more than 300 articles.

VP Operations/Production for initial Indiana plant start-up. Prior to acquisition of Holiday Rambler by Monaco Coach Corp, I created and established production plant operations in Indiana that in time equaled Oregon production facility.

Executive supervision and operational responsibility for motorhome and trailer construction. Designed and implemented processes and methods for production, all phases of motorhome and trailer divisions.

Executive, operational and design responsibility for the RoadMaster Chassis Division that supplied McCoy Miller Ambulance Division of larger parent company (Warrick Industries). Individually designed custom ambulance chassis to meet GSO KKK-A-1822 standard. Proto ambulance unit completed 50,000 mile accelerated durability testing at Bendix Proving Grounds without chassis failure.

Designed and helped sales bring to market on-highway bus for Goshen Coach Division of larger parent company (Warrick Industries). Supervised team that had operational responsibility for supplying entire shell as well as the chassis for this product. Designed and helped sales bring to market Goshen Coach Division unique low floor Airport Rental Car Shuttle. Supervised team that had operational responsibility for supplying entire shell as well as the chassis for this product.

Volunteered and provided "deep research" guidance and technical expertise to consumer organization FMCA. Review independent articles for technical correctness as support for FMC magazine editorial leadership and staff.

Legislative interface person. RVIA (Recreational Vehicle Industry Association) and Monaco Coach Corp specific legislative efforts. Member of RVIA Public and Legislative Affairs Committee, Chairman of Lemon-Law subcommittee until June 2012. Testimony at legislative hearings, one on one input, at state and federal level, as well as direct input to state governors of Oregon and California.

Member of IALLA (International Association of Lemon Law Administrators). Organization is in large part a coalition of states assistant Attorney's Generals and state Consumer Protection Division personnel.

Abbreviated pre-Monaco work history:

Pre- 1986

Executive Industries Inc. Hired as Sr. Manager for factory service center, warranty and parts operations. Promoted to Director, VP. Engineering oversight and responsibility for entire vehicle at VP level. ('81-'86)

Reliable RV/Denny's Automotive Co-owner, shared space, auto repair and RV repair business

Airstream- Trailer repair technician all systems and body.

MobileCraft/All-American Texaco/Alternative Fuels -Owner of mobile RV service company/Texaco gas station and company for propane fuel conversion in automotive/truck engines.

Corona RV Sales – Used coach refurbish mechanic and weekend sales person

Leisure Living RV – Ops director, parts and service. Part time retail sales at working level. Part time sales manager.

Mike Thompsons RV – Used coach refurbish mechanic all systems. Brake and front end mechanic. Service writer.

Bill Barry Pontiac GMC Truck & RV – Brake and front end mechanic for cars, trucks and motorhomes.

Phils Auto Repair & Machine Shop - Mechanic/machinist for cars and trucks

Fred's Shell Service – Mechanic cars and trucks

Security Tire Stores Inc. - Tire buster, became licensed brake mechanic.

Kelly Springfield Tire Co. - Unloaded tires from rail cars. Also worked with tire failure analysis group

US ARMY- Electronic equipment repairman. Honorable discharge, Viet Nam era vet ('70-'71)

Hawaiian Gardens TV repair – TV repairman

Service Schools and RV specific Training

RVIA Service Technician school curriculum

Intro to RV Service	Pre-Delivery Inspection	Preventative Maintenance	Electrical Systems
Propane Systems	Plumbing Systems	Air Conditioners	Refrigerators
Water Heaters	Ranges & Cooktops	Heating Appliances	Generators
Hydraulics	Brakes, Suspension & Towing		

Spartan Motors USA

Spartan Chassis/Entegra RV Training

Chassis general maintenance	Chassis Air Systems	Chassis Electrical	Cummins Engines
Chassis Troubleshooting	Brakes & Tires		

Spartan Motors USA continued

Entegra Specific

Inverters/Electrical

Jack system/equalizer

Slides/control Panel

Auto gen-start

Spartan Motors USA

Chassis specific ESC/SCV (Fire Truck/Motorhome) training

Spartan Warranty

Wabco Air System

Wabco ABS Brakes

Chassis Maintenance (DOT)

Cummins Engines

Chassis Elect VMUX

Data Link diagnostic

Air Conditioning

Chassis Brakes

Chassis Electrical

Drive line

Reyco-Granning Suspensions

Advanced Protection System (Air-Bags) w/cert ...40915RAPS

Monaco Inc

Developed curriculum and taught RV specific training

Education:

Navistar "University"

Navistar Defense:

International Trafficking of Arms Regulations (ITAR) Certified

Navistar Defense Code of Conduct

Government contracts

Careful Communication

Navistar Commercial

Information security

Business ethics

Record Retention

Education continued:

Navistar Commercial

Navistar Code of Conduct

Contracts

Gifts and Gratuities

Chaffee College- Machine tool & plastics technology

Golden West College – Business math, sociology, psychology, English

GM technical schools- Brake systems, power steering systems, powertrain systems

US Army –Multiple technical training schools in electronics

Kennedy High School – Graduated 1969 academic award, Industrial Arts, electronics, athletic letter in track and field

RV Specific Work Related Organizations

RVIA -- Recreational Vehicle Industry Association

- Public & Legislative Affairs Committee (past member)
- Lemon Law sub-committee P&LA (past chairman)

IALLA -- International Association of Lemon Law Administrators.

- Long standing member of this association of states assistant attorneys generals that have responsibility for their states respective lemon laws.

CHP-MSC-- California Highway Patrol-Motorhome Safety Committee.

- Led independent RV industry effort to legalize 40'+ motorhomes in California. Motorhome Safety Committee was outgrowth of that successful effort in the form of AB-67, signed into law by then governor Gray Davis.
- Acted, drove, script contribution for RV Safety Video required in 40'+ coaches in California

FMCA- Family Motor Coach Association—Motorhome Club

- Resource for consumers and manufacturers regarding all RV issues

General work Related Organizations

SAE-- Society of Automotive Engineers.

NFPA—National Fire Prevention Association

Licenses held current/prior:

CDL - Commercial Driver's License w/air-brake

Airplane Operators License

Brake Mechanic

Propane Mechanic

Organizations current/prior:

AOPA- Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association- Private Pilot

NRA- National Rifle Association

PADI- Professional Association of Dive Instructors

GreenPeace International

Citizens For A Safer Lane County Legislative Advocate

OSSA--Oregon State Sheriff's Association-citizen volunteer

LCPOA—Lane County Peace Officers Association-Legislative Advocate

Current and prior legislative advocacy affiliations:

Prevost Car Inc .

Country Coach Inc.

Blue Bird Bus Inc.

Featherlite Inc.

Newell Coach Inc.

Monaco Coach Corp

LCPOA

CFASLC

Publication History

Approximately 300 magazine articles ranging from technical to RV Lifestyle. Each of the four (4) Monaco Coach Club Magazines had a magazine. Sometimes one article would be written by me for each magazine and sometimes the same article would be published in two or more club magazines. However, the abrupt demise of Monaco Coach Corporation eliminated the opportunity to properly document earlier publication subject matter and/or copies of the articles.

Presentations & Publications

Emerging Technologies IALLA 2012

RV Lemon Laws in perspective IALLA 2006

Presentations & Publications continued

Several more presentations at IALLA, FMCA, Monaco RV Club seminars and moderations.

Professional & Personal references:

Several references are available for various areas of my specific expertise. Gladly provided upon request

Historical Trial and Deposition testimony

Several (approximately 50-75) Depositions, and (approximately 20+) Trial/hearing testimony occurrences

Abrupt demise of Monaco Coach Corp eliminated opportunity to properly document earlier expert deposition and trial testimony over a very wide variety of subjects related to RV's in previous 35+ years of my litigation history

Trial and Deposition testimony last four years:

Meyer v. Tiffin 11-CV-288 Federal District Court Western District of Wisconsin

Deposition testimony 5-22-2012 Expert testimony regarding use, value, repairs, of Luxury RV

Culver v. Tiffin CIVDS 1015358 California Superior Court San Bernardino Division

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome

Deposition 8-08-2012 Expert testimony regarding value, interior and exterior issues

Trial testimony 9-25-2012 same

Hobbs v. Freightliner Tiffin RV et al Civil Action 2010-090290 Sup Ct. Maricopa County Arizona

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome and chassis

Binding Arbitration Hearing testimony Formal binding arbitration 11-16-12 Chassis weight, design, vehicle value

Haley v. Wichita RV Haley v. Wichita RV Case No. 11 CV 1511 18th JUDICIAL DISTRICT SEDGWICK COUNTY, KS

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome

Deposition 11-30-2012 Expert Testimony regards coach slide out and various other coach systems, manufacturing processes etc

Schiel v. Navistar et al USDC Arizona 2:13-cv-00473-GMS

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome and chassis

Deposition 1-14-2014 Expert testimony regarding value, interior, service, exterior chassis issues

King v. Navistar et al USDC Arizona CV-00964-PHX-DGC

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome and chassis

Deposition 1-15-2014 Expert testimony regarding value, interior, exterior, chassis issues

Christian v. CAT Monaco Navistar et al California Superior Court 30-2011-00478320

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome and chassis

Deposition 2-28-2014 Sworn Percipient witness testimony regarding vehicle chassis manufacturing, design, service, post manufacture processes etc

Trial and Deposition testimony last four years continued:

Sura v Monaco RV Allied Recreational Group et al CAP RV - Florida Case # 90131002

Case Description Consumer dissatisfied with quality and service of motorhome and chassis

Binding Arbitration Hearing testimony 7-09-2014 Sworn hearing testimony regarding vehicle chassis manufacturing, design, service, post manufacture processes etc

State Farm (Subrogee of Knapp) v Northgate Parts et al USDC, E. District of TN No. 1:13-cv-99

Case Description Property loss due to Motorhome fire

Deposition 9-9-14 fire cause and origin opinion